

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The claims have been amended by the incorporation of the subject matter of claims 3 to 5 into claim 1. Now the lock formations are described as "complementary interfitting conical dimples,"

Nothing in the art suggests such lock formations.


US 5,117,536 of B each shows in FIGS. 15 and 16 interfitting lock formations that are neither conical nor complementary. These formations are more expensive to make and will not hold as well as those of this invention.

US 3,188,706 of Partridge has rounded dimples that are likely to slip off each other, not hold like the conical formations of amended claim 1.

Thus claim 1 describes a structure not shown in the cited references, so a §102 rejection is impossible. Since nothing

suggests the shape of amended claim 1, a rejection under §103 is also out of the question.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



---

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597  
Attorney for Applicant

20 December 2005  
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900  
Bronx, NY 10471-0900  
Cust. No.: 535  
Tel: (718) 884-6600  
Fax: (718) 601-1099